

1 **Correlation between religiosity and family functioning**  
2 **among secondary school students in high-risk residing areas**  
3 **and factors associated with substance use**

4 Noor Adnin binti Ab Aziz <sup>1¶</sup> , Suzaily Wahab <sup>1¶\*</sup> , Rosnah binti Sutan <sup>2¶</sup> , Muhammad Adib  
5 Baharom <sup>3&</sup> , Amirul Danial Azmi<sup>1</sup> , Siti Azirah binti Asmai <sup>4</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, University Kebangsaan Malaysia

7 <sup>2</sup>Department of Community Health, Faculty of Medicine, University Kebangsaan Malaysia

8 <sup>3</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Hospital Selayang, Selangor Malaysia

9 <sup>4</sup>Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Information and Communication Technology,  
10 Technical University of Malaysia Malacca Malaysia

11

12 \*corresponding author

13 E-mail: [suzaily@ppukm.ukm.edu.my](mailto:suzaily@ppukm.ukm.edu.my)

14

15 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

16 & This author also contributed equally to this work.

## 17 **Abstract**

18 *Introduction:* Substance use in adolescents poses a complex societal challenge that undermines  
19 nation-building and socioeconomic growth. Religiosity refers to a person's religious beliefs, habits,  
20 and involvement in religious activities. Family functioning refers to the overall health and  
21 operation of a family unit, which includes communication, emotional bonding, support, roles, and  
22 behavioral control. Both aspects play a significant impact in determining substance use in  
23 adolescents. This study is to assess the correlation between religiosity, and family functioning, and  
24 to determine factors associated with substance use among adolescents in secondary schools in  
25 high-risk areas. *Methods:* A cross-sectional study was conducted among 312 adolescents from  
26 selected secondary schools in substance use hotspot areas in Northern Malaysia. Alcohol,  
27 Smoking, and Substance Involvement Screening Tool-Lite (ASSIST-Lite), Family Adaptation and  
28 Cohesion Scale version IV (FACES-IV), and Hatta Islamic Religiosity Scale (HIRS) were used as  
29 instruments. *Results:* The prevalence of substance use among adolescents was 9.6%(n=30). Most  
30 of the users used a single substance (76.7%; n=23) and only (23.3%; n=7) used multiple  
31 substances. The mean age was 14.13 years (SD:0.67), and the majority were Malays (99.0%;  
32 n=309) with a background in Muslim religion. Adolescent substance use was significantly  
33 associated with gender (16.3% in males and 6.3% in females) and having a recent family history  
34 of substance use (16.8%). A negative correlation was found between substance use and family  
35 functioning; balanced flexibility (rs=-0.12; P=<0.05), family communication (rs=-0.12; P=<0.05),  
36 and family satisfaction (rs=-0.15; P=<0.01). There was a positive correlation between substance  
37 use and chaotic family (rs=0.12; P=<0.05). Regression analysis reveals that only male adolescents  
38 and a recent family history of substance use were significant predictors of substance use. Family  
39 satisfaction was the only significant protective factor. There was no significant association

40 between substance use and religiosity ( $r_s=-0.01$ ;  $P= 0.83$ ). *Conclusions*: These findings can assist  
41 policymakers, healthcare professionals and schools develop interventions to reduce substance use,  
42 especially in high-risk communities, and increase adolescents' well-being in general.

43

44 Keywords: Substance use, Adolescent, Secondary school, Religiosity, Family function

45

## 46 **Introduction**

47  
48 Substance or drug use is a worldwide problem and the prevalence of substance use among  
49 adolescents reveals a rising trend of use [1,2]. World Drug Report 2023 revealed in 2021, one out  
50 of every seventeen people aged 15 to 64 in the world have used a drug within the previous year  
51 [3]. Substance or drug use refers to the consumption or intake of psychoactive substances,  
52 including tobacco, alcohol, prescription medications, and illicit drugs. Tobacco and alcohol are  
53 examples of licit psychoactive substances, while illicit substances include amphetamines, heroin,  
54 cocaine, marijuana, and lysergic diethylamide (LSD). It has a substantial impact on public services,  
55 the criminal justice system, and health care services in the long term [4]. In Malaysia, the National  
56 Anti-Drugs Agency Ministry of Home Affairs reports that from 2016 to 2020, the number of  
57 substance and drug use detected by the state and among adolescents exhibited an upward trend as  
58 well. Synthetic drugs appear to be more commonly used than organic drugs. The most used illicit  
59 drugs in Malaysia include methamphetamine (crystalline), amphetamine-type stimulants, heroin  
60 and morphine, methamphetamine (pills), and cannabis.

61       Religiosity, defined as the extent and intensity of a person's religious beliefs, practices, and  
62 experiences, varies greatly between cultures [5]. It has a substantial impact on adolescents, their  
63 behaviors, and lifestyle choices, including substance use. In Western countries, religion frequently  
64 stresses personal belief and individualized spirituality, with a high degree of secularism and a wide  
65 range of religious affiliations. Numerous studies have found that religiosity serves as a protective  
66 factor for substance use [6–9]. In ASEAN countries, religiosity is more communal and profoundly  
67 incorporated into daily life, with state-endorsed religions such as Islam in Malaysia [10]. The  
68 majority of Malays in Malaysia practice Islam as their religion. They are taught fundamental  
69 knowledge and practice about Islam since primary school. A few local research found that strong

70 religious views were protective of substance use among Malaysian youths [11,12]. Given this prior  
71 information about the students and their devotion to Islam, as well as the lack of research on the  
72 relationship between religiosity and substance use among adolescents, the fact that many Malay  
73 adolescents continue to use substances is alarming. This study aims to assess religiosity among  
74 adolescents in terms of knowledge and practice following Islamic teachings and the correlation  
75 with substance use.

76  
77 Previous research has shown that a person's physical and psychological development is  
78 profoundly affected by their family. Family functioning is defined as the quality and health of  
79 interactions and relationships within a family unit. A family's primary functions include instilling  
80 beliefs, values, and acceptable behavior in society, particularly during childhood [13]. Many  
81 previous literatures reported poor family functioning as a significant factor that contributed to  
82 substance use [14–16]. Family functioning in this study refers to family cohesion and adaptability.  
83 Family cohesion is the emotional connection of family members, an instance in which all members  
84 of the family are accountable for one another, whereas adaptability refers to the extent to which a  
85 family structure is adaptable to changes.

86 In Malaysia, the Malaysian Anti-Drug Agency (AADK) identified 155 drug-related  
87 hotspots in 2020. The northern region of Malaysia, which comprises a few states in association  
88 with the Thai border, is recognized as a hotspot for substance usage [17]. Adolescents in hotspot  
89 areas may have a greater predisposition for substance use than those in non-hotspot areas.  
90 Adolescence are the group vulnerable to drug use and addiction as they have a high tendency  
91 toward risking new experiences, and novelty, are prone to peer pressure, and have poor self-esteem  
92 [18]. This issue may start at 12 to 17 years and may crown between the ages of 18 and 25 years  
93 [19]. The earlier a person begins engaging in substance use, the higher their chance of developing

94 substance-use disorder. The use of other illicit substances is often preceded by using-  
95 substances, such as tobacco and alcohol [20]. More harmful consequences on health and  
96 psychosocial wellness in adolescents compared to adults as it often lasts longer into their lives  
97 because of joblessness, monetary reliance, and deficient social affairs. 10,600 adolescents in  
98 Malaysia have used drugs at least once in their lives [21].

99 In keeping with the numerous factors that contribute to adolescent substance use and the  
100 lack of studies done locally involving adolescents in the hotspot areas, our study intended to  
101 evaluate the relationship between substance use, religiosity, and family functioning among  
102 adolescents.

## 103 **Methodology**

### 104 **Research design, study area, and data collection**

105 A cross-sectional study was conducted in selected secondary schools from the Northern Malaysia  
106 region. The data was obtained using stratified random sampling from December 1st to 15th, 2023.  
107 The class teachers and students were informed about the study's methods, objectives, participation  
108 benefits, and risks, affirmed anonymity, and the ability to leave at any point. Those who obtained  
109 consent from both their parents and them were asked to fill out questionnaires using Google Forms,  
110 an online survey platform. Duplicate responses were removed during data cleaning. This study  
111 was approved by the Institution's research ethics committee (UKM PPI/111/8/JEP-2023-076) and  
112 granted permission from the Education Planning and Research Division, Ministry of Education  
113 Malaysia.

114 The sample size was calculated using the formula  $N = Z^2P(1-P)/d^2$  (Kish L 1969). Since the  
115 previous study's prevalence was 17.2% [16], with a precision of 0.05, the sample size needed was

116 215 respondents. After accounting for an expected 20% of non-respondents, 44 more respondents  
117 were added, resulting in a total sample size of 263. The inclusion requirements included secondary  
118 school students aged 13-16 years old, students with a background in Muslim Religion, who can  
119 understand and write Malay or English, and who have parental or carer agreements. The study  
120 excluded 17-year-olds since they are exam group students in Form 5.

## 121 **Study instruments**

122 All respondents were assigned a sociodemographic questionnaire, the Hatta Islamic Religiosity  
123 Scale (HIRS), the Family Adaptation and Cohesion Scale version IV (FACES-IV), and the  
124 Alcohol, Smoking, and Substance Involvement Screening Tool-Lite (ASSIST-Lite). All  
125 questionnaires were translated and validated in the Malay language. Permission to use all the  
126 relevant questionnaires was obtained from the original authors.

## 127 **Alcohol, Smoking, And Substance Involvement Screening Tool-Lite** 128 **(ASSIST-Lite)**

129 Substance use was measured using a validated Malay version of ASSIST-Lite which is an  
130 abbreviated version of ASSIST. It is a screening tool to evaluate the substance use, the frequency  
131 of usage, and drug use by a variety of drugs of concern such as nicotine, alcohol, cannabis,  
132 amphetamine-type stimulants, sedatives, opioids, and other substances within the last 3 months. It  
133 consists of six core components with three to four items and two additional items. The substance  
134 score is calculated by summing points acquired for that substance. The internal and test-retest  
135 reliability of the Malay version of ASSIST-Lite were good, with alpha values ranging from 0.772  
136 to 0.882 and Kappa values ranging from 0.8 to 1.

## 137 **The Hatta Islamic Religiosity Scale (HIRS96)**

138 It is a 27-item scale to evaluate basic Islamic knowledge and practice among Muslim adults and  
139 adolescents in Malaysia. It was devised in 1996 by Mohamed Hatta Shaharom. It comprises 4 parts  
140 with 15 questions on basic Islamic knowledge following primary and lower secondary school  
141 curriculum, 10 questions on basic Islamic practice by the obligation of practicing Muslim based  
142 on the Holy Quran and al-Hadith, 1 question on degree of Qur'an reading, and 1 question evaluate  
143 respondent encouraging good and forbidding bad habit, which is competency, obligatory on all  
144 Muslims. For each component, a Likert score is used. This is a valid and reliable tool. It has high  
145 Inter-rater reliability for total HIRS score (0.90). The higher the score, the higher the religiosity  
146 [22].

## 147 **Family Adaptation And Cohesion Scale Version IV (FACES-IV)**

148 It was used to assess components of family functioning, which were conceptualized using the  
149 Circumplex Model. It is a self-rated test that includes 42 items for balanced and unbalanced scales,  
150 10 items for family communication, and 10 items for family satisfaction. FACES-IV's reliability  
151 ranges from 0.77 to 0.89 for all six domains. It also has a high discriminant validity of 0.84-0.99  
152 across all its domains. It includes three aspects of family behavior: cohesion, adaptability, and  
153 communication. Cohesion is the emotional bond among family members. Flexibility refers to the  
154 degree of change in family leadership, relational roles, and rules. Communication empowers a  
155 family to modulate its level of cohesion or flexibility. This study used the Malay-translated  
156 questionnaire which was pre-tested among 50 respondents. The Cronbach's alpha for the translated  
157 Malay version of FACES-IV was 0.68.



## 158 **Statistical analysis**

159 The acquired data was analyzed using the most recent version of the Statistical Package for Social  
160 Science (SPSS 29; SPSS Inc., Chicago, Illinois, United States) version 29. The relationships  
161 between study variables were analyzed using correlation tests. The statistical study used a p-value  
162 of  $< 0.05$  to indicate significance. All categorical variables (gender, age, race, total household  
163 income per month, and father and mother's highest education level) were presented in frequency,  
164 percentage, and Chi-square test. Descriptive analysis was used to determine the prevalence of  
165 substance use among Secondary School Students in high-risk residing areas. The Kolmogorov-  
166 Smirnov test was used to measure normality test. Binary logistic regression analysis was used to  
167 determine predicted factors with substance use among Secondary School Students in high-risk  
168 residing areas.

## 169 **Results**

### 170 **Demographic characteristics**

171 A total of 312 adolescents from selected secondary schools were enrolled in the study. Table 1  
172 furnished an outline of the sociodemographics of the respondents. The students' ages ranged from  
173 13 to 16 with 66.7% (n = 208) being female and 33.3% (n = 104) being male. The students' mean  
174 age was 14.13 (SD = 0.673). 99.7% (n = 309) of the adolescents were Malay. There were 69.9%  
175 (n=218) of the students from low-income families, with a monthly household income of less than  
176 RM2500. Most of their mothers and fathers were reported to have at least a secondary school level  
177 of education as their highest education level, with 93.3% (n= 291) and 92.6% (n= 289),  
178 respectively. 32.4% (n=101) of their family members were reported to have used a substance  
179 recently.

180 Of the 312 secondary school students, (9.6%; n= 30) acknowledged using single or  
 181 polysubstance recently according to ASSIST-Lite. Malay students (9.7%; n=30) in early  
 182 adolescence (10%; n=28), male gender (16.3%; n=17), and highest education level of secondary  
 183 school or higher for mother (9.3%; n=27) and father (10.0%; n=29), make up most recent substance  
 184 users. Most of them were from low-income families with monthly total household income of less  
 185 than RM2500 (11.0%; n = 24). In addition, (16.8%; n=17) indicated a recent family history of  
 186 substance use.

187 **Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of participants & association with substance use**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Total number of participants n=312 (%)</b>	<b>Substance Use n= 30 (%)</b>	<b>Not use Substance n=282 (%)</b>	<b>Chi-square test □<sup>2</sup> (df)</b>	<b>P value</b>
<b>Gender</b>				8.132 (1)	.004
Girl	208 (66.7)	13 (6.3)	195 (93.8)		
Boy	104 (33.3)	17 (16.3)	87 (83.7)		
<b>Age</b>				0.537 (1)	.464
Early adolescent	279 (89.4)	28 (10.0)	251 (90.0)		
Middle adolescent	33 (10.6)	2 (6.0)	31 (93.9)		
<b>Race</b>				0.322 (1)	.570
Malays	309 (99.0)	30 (9.7)	279 (90.3)		
Non-Malays	3 (1.0)	0	3 (100.0)		
<b>Total household income in the family</b>				1.617 (1)	.203
< RM2500.00	218 (69.9)	24 (11.0)	194 (89.0)		
>RM2500.00	94 (30.1)	6 (6.4)	88 (93.6)		
<b>Highest level of education for mother</b>				0.565 (1)	.452
Nil and primary school	21 (6.7)	3 (14.3)	18 (84.7)		
>Secondary school	291 (93.3)	27 (9.3)	264 (90.7)		
<b>Highest level of education for father:</b>				0.793 (1)	.373
Nil & primary school	23 (7.4)	1 (4.3)	22 (95.7)		
>Secondary school	289 (92.6)	29 (10.0)	260 (90.0)		
<b>Any family members recently use substance:</b>				8.949 (1)	.003
Yes	101 (32.4)	17 (16.8)	84 (83.2)		
No	211 (67.6)	13 (6.2)	198 (93.8)		

188 Early adolescent (13,14 years old), Middle adolescent (15,16 years old)

189

190 Table 2 furnished that cigarettes were the most widely used current substance among students  
 191 (4.8%; n = 15), followed by alcohol (2.2%; n = 7). Among the illicit substances, stimulants (1.6%,  
 192 n = 5) were the most frequently used substances according to ASSIST-Lite.

193 **Table 2. Prevalence of substance or drug use based on drug type**

Type of Substance		n= 312	%
Tobacco	Not Use	297	95.2%
	Use	15	4.8%
Alcohol	Not Use	305	97.8%
	Use	7	2.2%
Amphetamine-type stimulants	Not Use	307	98.4%
	Use	5	1.6%
Cannabis	Not Use	308	98.7%
	Use	4	1.3%
Inhalants, sedatives, hallucinogens	Not Use	308	98.7%
	Use	4	1.3%
Opioids	Not Use	309	99.0%
	Use	3	1.0%

194

195 Whereas Table 3 outlines the prevalence of current single or polysubstance use.

196 **Table 3. Prevalence of single or polysubstance Use**

Substance use	n=30	%
Single Substance Use	23	76.7%
Poly Substance Use	7	23.3%

197

## 198 **Descriptive data for religiosity**

199 The religiosity profile of respondents based on the Hatta Islamic Religiosity (HIRS) Index yields  
200 a mean score of 63.35 with an SD = 8.61 indicating a higher religiosity score. Table 4 shows  
201 Islamic knowledge and practice scores were 23.04 with SD=2.88 and 35.58 with SD=7.15  
202 respectively. Approximately more than 50% of respondents had a higher score of Islamic  
203 knowledge and practice.

204 **Table 4. Religiosity profile of respondents according to HIRS**

Descriptive Statistic	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
HIRS Total Score	312	38.00	84.00	63.3526	8.61264
HIRS Islamic Knowledge	312	16.00	30.00	23.0449	2.87990
HIRS Islamic Practice	312	14.00	50.00	35.5769	7.15294

205

206

## 207 **Descriptive data for family functioning**

208 Table 5 shows the respondents' family profiles which were outlined in terms of the balanced scales  
209 (cohesion and flexibility), unbalanced scales (enmeshed, rigid, disengaged, and chaotic), family  
210 satisfaction, and family communication. Each scale was classified accordingly. The mean scores  
211 of the balanced measures were higher than those of the unbalanced scales among the individuals  
212 (26.00 and 19.14, respectively). The mean scores for family communication and family  
213 satisfaction were 37.37 (SD = 6.33) and 37.79 (SD = 6.18), respectively. The cohesion ratio  
214 [balanced cohesion/ (disengaged + enmeshed/2)], flexibility ratio [balanced flexibility/ (rigid +  
215 chaotic/2)] and total circumplex ratio (cohesion ratio + flexibility ratio/2) exceeded 1 indicating  
216 that their family functioning was balanced.

217

218

**Table 5. Family functioning of respondents based on FACES IV**

<b>Dimensions</b>	<b>Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Median ± IQR</b>	<b>min.-max.</b>
<b>Balanced scales:</b>			
Cohesion	24.79 (3.35)	25.00 ± 4.00	8.0-35.0
Flexibility	27.21 (3.62)	28.00 ± 3.00	8.0-35.0
<b>Unbalanced scales:</b>			
Disengaged	17.40 (3.64)	17.00 ± 5.00	8.0-31.0
Enmeshed	20.49 (2.53)	21.00 ± 3.00	7.0-29.0
Rigid	22.95 (3.38)	23.00 ± 4.00	7.0-32.0
Chaotic	15.70 (3.92)	16.00 ± 5.00	7.0-27.0
<b>Ratio scores:</b>			
Cohesion ratio	1.32 (0.25)	1.31 ± 0.34	0.64-2.30
Flexibility ratio	1.44 (0.30)	1.41 ± 0.31	0.68-3.09
Total circumflex ratio	1.38 (0.24)	1.38 ± 0.27	0.72-2.38
<b>Family scales:</b>			
Family communication	37.37 (6.33)	38.00 ± 7.00	10.0-50.0
Family satisfaction level	37.79 (6.18)	39.00 ± 7.00	10.0-50.0

219

220 **Correlation between religiosity and family functioning with**  
 221 **substance use.**

222 The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied statistically to determine the age distribution of the  
 223 respondents. A non-parametric test (Spearman's rho) was utilized because the respondents' ages  
 224 were not normally distributed. As reported in Table 6, there was no significant correlation found  
 225 between religious knowledge and practice and substance use.

226 **Table 6. Islamic religiosity profile according to substance use**

		Religiosity profile		
		Knowledge	Practice	Religiosity
Spearman's rho	Substance use	-0.82	0.004	-0.012
		Sig. (2-tailed)	0.15	0.95

227 \*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

228

229 As depicted in Table 7, there is a significant negative correlation between family functioning and  
 230 substance use in terms of balanced flexibility ( $r_s = -.116$ ;  $P < .05$ ), family communication ( $r_s = -.116$ ;  
 231  $P < .05$ ) and satisfaction ( $r_s = -.153$ ;  $P < .01$ ). On top of that, there is a significant positive  
 232 correlation between chaotic family and substance use ( $r_s = .122$ ;  $P < .05$ ).

233

234

**Table 7. Family functioning profile according to the substance use status**

			<b>Cohesion</b>	<b>Flexibility</b>	<b>Disengaged</b>	<b>Enmeshed</b>	<b>Rigid</b>	<b>Chaotic</b>	<b>Communication</b>	<b>Satisfaction</b>
Spearman's rho	Substance use	Correlation Coefficient	-.067	-.116*	.080	.009	-.007	.122*	-.116*	-.153**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.238	.041	.157	.875	.900	.031	.041	.007

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

235

236 **Multiple logistic regression analysis of significant variables**

237 We used the stepwise logistic regression analysis method to investigate substance use predictors.

238 The final model includes male gender, a recent family history of substance use, and family

239 satisfaction as significant predictors as shown in Table 8. Adolescent boys were 4.23 times more

240 likely to use substances than teenage girls (CI=1.68 – 10.64, p<0.05). Respondents with a family

241 history of recent substance use were 2.68 times more likely to use substances than those who are

242 not using substances with no family history of recent substance use (CI= 1.11-6.43, p<0.05).

243 Respondents with family satisfaction were 0.27 times less likely to use substances than those who

244 did not have family satisfaction (CI= 0.08-0.87, p<0.05).

245

246



247

**Table 8. Multiple logistic regression for substance use**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>P-value</b>	<b>Odds Ratio</b>	<b>95% Confidence Interval</b>
Gender (Boy)	1.44	0.47	<b>0.002</b>	4.23	1.68 – 10.64
Family history of recent substance use	0.99	0.45	<b>0.028</b>	2.68	1.11 – 6.43
Family Flexibility	0.25	0.77	0.746	1.28	0.285 – 5.76
Family Chaotic	0.24	0.59	0.687	1.27	0.40 – 3.99
Family Communication	0.41	0.69	0.555	1.50	0.39- 5.83
Family Satisfaction	-1.32	0.60	<b>0.028</b>	0.27	0.08 – 0.87

248 B: beta; SE: standard error

249

## 250 **Discussion**

251 Identifying the pattern of substance use among adolescents is crucial for delivering the best  
252 prevention, intervention, and harm reduction strategies. This study investigated the relationship  
253 between religiosity and family functioning with substance use and factors associated among  
254 Secondary school students in Northern Malaysia, a high-risk area.

255 The prevalence of substance use among adolescents is 9.6%. The prevalence is consistent  
256 with a study conducted in Egypt for polysubstance use [23]. This study found a lower prevalence  
257 than studies from other countries, including Timor-Leste, the United States, Norway, and Iran [24–  
258 27]. These disparities in findings could be attributed to the study's data collection method (i.e.  
259 online survey method), sampling size, and respondent characteristics, while other research used  
260 high school and university students and a broader age range (age 16-40) as samples. Other causes  
261 may include cultural differences and social customs.

262 The present study shows cigarettes (4.8%) are the most often used substance, followed by  
263 alcohol (2.2%), stimulants (1.6%), inhalants (1.3%), and cannabis (1.3%). This finding is  
264 consistent with prior local studies that indicated current tobacco and alcohol usage among those in  
265 secondary school (15 to 18 years old) to be 6.6% and 2.4%, respectively [28]. De la Torre-Luque  
266 and colleagues discovered that tobacco was the most often used substance among adolescents in  
267 Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, and Thailand [29]. However, the present  
268 study showed a lower percentage of tobacco and alcohol use compared to the NHMS 2022, which  
269 revealed 9.0% and 7.4% respectively. It also exhibited a lower prevalence when compared to other  
270 majority Muslim populations or ASEAN countries [30–32]. One systematic study found that  
271 nicotine product usage was a strong predictor of future cannabis use among adolescents [33].

272 This study revealed that a higher proportion of substance use were males (56.7%) and  
273 Malays ethnicity (99.0%). Even though most of the respondents are female, the study still shows  
274 male gender (16.3%) contributed a higher substance use compared to females (6.3%). The  
275 prevalence was consistent with the Department of Statistics Malaysia in 2020 revealing substance  
276 users are greater among the male gender, Bumiputeras, and highest education level secondary  
277 school. According to the National Health and Morbidity Survey (NHMS 2022), three out of every  
278 four drug users began using drugs before the age of 14. This finding is in keeping with the present  
279 study as we found that early adolescents (13-14 years old) were more likely to use substances.  
280 Whereas according to the World Health Organization(WHO) and other overseas studies [23,34]  
281 higher substance use among adolescents aged 14 – 17 years old. These disparities can be attributed  
282 to the generalizability of the studies, which included a broader range of adolescent ages than our  
283 study. Despite the country's smoking prohibition for adolescents under the age of 18, many factors  
284 lead to ongoing smoking within this age group. The peer pressure and the desire to fit in with peers  
285 who smoke can encourage adolescents to begin and maintain smoking. Furthermore, easy access  
286 to tobacco products via older peers or family members can get beyond regulatory prohibitions. The  
287 portrayal of smoking in media and entertainment can further glamorize the habit, making it appear  
288 attractive and sophisticated. They can also purchase cigarettes from commercial sources according  
289 to research conducted at selected secondary schools in Peninsular Malaysia [35]. Adolescents may  
290 also be influenced by family views toward smoking, as parental or sibling smoking might  
291 normalize the activity. The gateway theory can explain why licit substances, such as tobacco and  
292 alcohol, are frequently used before more illegal substances. This hypothesis stated that drug use  
293 happens in stages, beginning with the use of licit substances like tobacco and alcohol and  
294 progressing to the use of illicit drugs.

295 Adolescent substance use can also be significantly influenced by family members who use  
296 substances. Our findings indicate that 16.8% of adolescents had a family history of recent  
297 substance use. This finding was consistent with other studies that identified familial environment  
298 as a social element in youth substance use [11,36–39]. We based our hypothesis on Albert  
299 Bandura's social learning theory and Ajzen's theory of planned behavior. Bandura hypothesized  
300 that any social learning environment contains both models and learners. In this social learning  
301 context, learners witness and imitate their models' activities, either purposefully or unintentionally,  
302 which may explain why adolescents use substances more commonly when they have family  
303 members who use substances.

304 Adolescents from families with low incomes frequently endure increased stress and  
305 instability, which might lead them to seek joy or escape through substance use. Parents in low-  
306 income families may have to work several jobs or long hours, which results in less supervision and  
307 engagement with their children, making adolescents more exposed to negative peer pressures and  
308 risky behaviors. Inadequate financial resources might also limit access to community activities and  
309 support networks that promote healthy development and substance use prevention. Several studies  
310 have found a link between low-income families and adolescent substance use [40–42]. This is  
311 consistent with the current study, which indicated that most of the adolescents who use substances  
312 come from low-income families. A few studies have shown that adolescents from lower parental  
313 education levels are more likely to use substances [11,40,41]. This is in keeping with the present  
314 study that most adolescents who use substances also have parents with a level of secondary school  
315 education or can be considered among low education level. Their parents may face various socio-  
316 economic challenges, including lower income, and be less aware of the hazards and consequences  
317 of substance use, resulting in less effective communication and monitoring for drug and alcohol

318 prevention. Economic issues related to poorer educational attainment can cause increased stress in  
319 the home, producing settings in which adolescents may turn to substances as a coping mechanism.

320 Overall, the respondents in our study have balanced family functioning which balanced  
321 scales showed connected in cohesion level with flexible in flexibility level. In addition, the  
322 unbalanced scales show low levels for disengaged and enmeshed, very low levels for chaotic, and  
323 moderate levels for rigid [42]. Family functioning in terms of balanced flexibility, family  
324 satisfaction, and communication shows a negative correlation with substance use indicating that  
325 high family flexibility, family communication, and family satisfaction, as assessed by the FACES-  
326 IV, play protective roles in preventing substance use among adolescents due to their contributions  
327 to a supportive and adaptive family environment. High family flexibility refers to a family's ability  
328 to adjust to changes, handle stress, and reorganize roles and responsibilities. This adaptability  
329 contributes to a stable yet dynamic environment in which adolescents feel supported and  
330 understood, lowering the likelihood of them turning to substances as a method of coping with  
331 stress or uncertainty. Effective communication within the family is essential for building trust,  
332 understanding, and emotional support. When family members talk openly and honestly,  
333 adolescents are more likely to share their concerns, seek advice, and feel valued. This open  
334 communication can aid in detecting early signs of distress or harmful behaviors, allowing for  
335 prompt interventions. High family satisfaction reflects a positive and rewarding family experience,  
336 as evidenced by strong emotional relationships, mutual support, and a sense of happiness within  
337 the family. Adolescents who are happy with their family relationships are more likely to internalize  
338 positive family values and norms. These 3 aspects will discourage the adolescent from seeking  
339 comfort or validation through substance use. The present study also shows there is a significant  
340 positive correlation between a chaotic family and substance use implying that an adolescent who

341 had a more chaotic family would increase substance use. Our findings are consistent with previous  
342 research highlighting the importance of a healthy family dynamic and the parent-adolescent  
343 relationship in reflecting whole-family functioning, which can be protective of adolescent  
344 substance use [43–48].

345 Previous research has found that people with low religiosity scores use more substances.  
346 Previous studies also show a significant association between substance use and religiosity, with  
347 strong religiosity being related to a reduced rate of substance use due to a conservative attitude  
348 against substance use and improved psychological well-being [9,48–50]. However, our findings  
349 reveal that there is no association between religiosity and substance use, even though respondents  
350 had higher religiosity scores for the knowledge and practice component. While religiosity  
351 often promotes beliefs and actions that hinder substance use, its impact can be diminished by other  
352 relevant factors in an adolescent's life despite being born Muslim. Peer pressure and the desire for  
353 social approval can sometimes override religious principles, particularly during a developmental  
354 stage marked by experimentation and the formation of identity. Furthermore, the level and  
355 intensity of religious participation can vary; for some adolescents, religious practices may be more  
356 superficial or culturally expected than profoundly internalized, limiting their influence on  
357 behavior. Adolescents from strongly religious families may face strictness, which can lead to  
358 rebellious and secretive behaviors, including substance use, as a form of protest. These  
359 complicated interactions demonstrate that, while religiosity can be a protective factor, it is not an  
360 absolute barrier to substance use in adolescents.

361 Our final analysis using logistic regression reveals male gender, recent family history of  
362 substance use, and family satisfaction as significant predictors of substance use among

363 adolescents. The present study found that male adolescents are four times more likely than female  
364 adolescents to use substances, which is consistent with previous studies indicating that males use  
365 substances more than females [23,36,37,39,40,51]. Our study shows the likelihood of substance  
366 use among adolescents was 2.68 times (CI: 1.11 - 6.43) higher among adolescent boys from  
367 substance-using families. This finding is consistent with previous studies showing that adolescents  
368 are more likely to use substances if their family members use substances [52,53].

369         Family satisfaction is a protective factor, making adolescents 0.27 times (CI: 0.08-0.87)  
370 less likely to use substances. It is one of the domains of FACES-IV that assesses how satisfied  
371 adolescents are with their relationships with other family members and family dynamics. This  
372 scale assesses communication, emotional bonding, support, problem-solving skills, and  
373 adaptability to change and stress. Higher scores on this measure suggest higher contentment and  
374 perceived effectiveness in family functioning, whereas lower scores may indicate areas where  
375 family members are detached or unsatisfied. Previous research has also highlighted the importance  
376 of family satisfaction as a whole family functioning be a protective factor against substance use  
377 among adolescents [54].

378         In summary only male gender, family history of substance use, and family functioning,  
379 specifically family satisfaction were shown as significant predictors of substance use among  
380 adolescents. Religiosity was not significant with substance use.

381

## 382 **Study limitations and recommendations**

383 Our study has a few limitations, and the findings must be carefully evaluated. First, the study  
384 design is cross-sectional, hence only allowing the determination of the association between  
385 dependent and independent variables but not causal relationships. Second, the substance use status  
386 of adolescents was obtained by self-reporting without any other objective validation such as urine  
387 drug toxicology. Some respondents may remain apprehensive, and concerned about how the  
388 information provided to the researchers may be used due to possible legal implications. Third, the  
389 study was limited to a selected secondary school in the Northern area of Malaysia and included  
390 only students aged 13 to 16 which reduces the study's capacity and generalization of the findings.  
391 This study focuses only on Muslim adolescents, and it would be beneficial if similar studies  
392 included a variety of religions and ethnicities to reflect the population of adolescents in Malaysia  
393 since Malaysia is a multiracial and multicultural country.

394         Despite certain limitations, these findings possess significant implications for future  
395 interventions to address the problem, thus effective interventions should be multifaceted.

396         Parents play an important role in fostering coping skills and drive for their children's  
397 achievement. Parents should be offered interaction and supervision skills training, as well as family  
398 therapy to improve family relations and satisfaction. Policymakers and schools should collaborate  
399 to provide materials and workshops to assist parents in better understanding adolescent  
400 development and good parenting methods. Such support can help parents identify signs of distress  
401 in their children and provide appropriate support to alleviate the problem.



402 Schools need to implement comprehensive substance use prevention programs, integrate  
403 mental health services, and promote extracurricular activities that engage students in positive  
404 ways. Regular and continuous psychoeducation for adolescents about the implications or adverse  
405 consequences of substance use, which began with smoking, is critical to preventing future use of  
406 illicit drugs. This purpose should be incorporated into the school module and emphasized by potent  
407 school policy. Much attention must be taken to prevent any "soft" substance commencing (tobacco  
408 and alcohol), particularly at a young age. Tobacco, alcohol, and illegal drug control programs  
409 should prioritize reducing youth access to these substances. For at-risk students, the school has to  
410 offer prompt interventions that are characterized by poor coping skills and diminishing academic  
411 performance. These initiatives may include counseling services, academic support programs, and  
412 referrals to external resources. Recognizing and addressing mental and emotional challenges at an  
413 early stage may help adolescents avoid resorting to drugs as a coping method. Adolescents will  
414 benefit from having access to counseling and mentorship programs, which can help them develop  
415 resilience and appropriate coping skills.

416 Public health initiatives should be established to educate adolescents about the risks of drug  
417 use. These efforts should address adolescents and their parents to underline the necessity of  
418 maintaining good academic achievement as well as the potential harmful effects of substance  
419 use on academic success and future opportunities.

420 Policymakers have to set up mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating the efficacy of  
421 coping skills interventions and therapies offered in schools. Regular assessments can help identify  
422 areas for development and ensure that resources are spent efficiently on programs that yield  
423 positive results. Such interventions may enhance the coping skills and academic performance of

424 vulnerable adolescents. Enforcing strict regulations on substance availability to minors, increasing  
425 funding for prevention and treatment programs, and launching public awareness campaigns are  
426 essential as well. These interventions can collectively address the root causes and protective factors  
427 of adolescent substance use, creating a supportive environment that reduces risk and promotes  
428 healthy development.

429         Relevant organizations and agencies must also take a more proactive approach to assisting  
430 and monitoring adolescents to safeguard their well-being and prevent additional substance use  
431 disorders or dependence.

432

## 433 **Conclusion**

434 Our study involved adolescents from selected schools from hotspot substance areas which can  
435 provide insights that are directly applicable to areas where intervention is most needed.

436         In conclusion, these findings can be used to reinforce existing policy initiatives for  
437 adolescents to establish a drug-free environment. Emphasizing the importance of parents and  
438 family members in recognizing early signs of distress, better communication, and support may  
439 help at-risk adolescents develop better ways to cope despite their substance use. The significant  
440 consequences of the study include heightened awareness, prompt identification, and intervention  
441 for adolescents and parents through both universal school-based and tailored programs. Preventing  
442 substance use in early adolescence requires a collaborative effort among parents, schools, public  
443 health professionals, policymakers, and other stakeholders because of the multifaceted nature of

444 the issue. By working together, these groups can create a consistent and reinforced message,  
445 address the social determinants of health, and build a resilient community that supports the healthy  
446 development of adolescents, ultimately reducing the incidence of substance use and its associated  
447 consequences. Nonetheless, the data were self-reported, and focusing on school-age adolescents  
448 may exclude high-risk adolescents who have dropped out of school.

#### 449 **Author contributions**

450 Conceptualization: Noor Adnin binti Ab Aziz, Suzaily Wahab, Rosnah binti Sutan

451 Data curation: Rosnah binti Sutan, Muhammad Adib Baharom, Amirul Danial Azmi

452 Formal analysis: Rosnah binti Sutan, Siti Azirah binti Asmai

453 Funding acquisition: Suzaily Wahab

454 Methodology: Noor Adnin binti Ab Aziz, Suzaily Wahab, Rosnah binti Sutan

455 Project administration: Noor Adnin binti Ab Aziz, Suzaily Wahab

456 Supervision: Suzaily Wahab.

457 Writing – original draft: Noor Adnin binti Ab Aziz

458 Writing – review & editing: Suzaily Wahab, Rosnah binti Sutan, Muhammad Adib Baharom

459

## 460 **Acknowledgment**

461 The authors would like to express their gratitude to all students who were involved in this study.

462 We would like to thank the Director General of Health Malaysia for his permission to publish this  
463 article. We acknowledge the Medical Faculty of the University Kebangsaan Malaysia who support  
464 this publication.

465

## 466 **References**

- 467 1. Mavura RA, Nyaki AY, Leyaro BJ, Mamseri R, George J, Ngocho JS, et al. Prevalence of  
468 substance use and associated factors among secondary school adolescents in Kilimanjaro  
469 region, northern Tanzania. *PLoS One*. 2022 Sep 1;17(9 September).
- 470 2. Vellozo EP, de Souza Vitale MS, Passos MAZ, Niskier SR, Schoen TH, Hall PR, et al.  
471 Prevalence of psychoactive substance use by adolescents in public schools in a municipality  
472 in the São Paulo Metropolitan Area, Brazil. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2023;39(2).
- 473 3. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2018). *World Drug Report 2018*.  
474 Book 4: Drugs and Age. 2018.
- 475 4. Villadsen A, Fitzsimons E. Longitudinal predictors of weapon involvement in middle  
476 adolescence: Evidence from the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Aggress Behav*. 2023 Jan  
477 1;49(1):5–14.
- 478 5. Md Noon H, Mohamed Haneef M, Abdullah Yusof S, Mohd Amin R. *Religiosity and Social*  
479 *Problems in Malaysia*. Vols. II, No. I. 2003.
- 480 6. Li S De, Lu J, Chen Y. The Relationship between Christian Religiosity and Adolescent  
481 Substance Use in China. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022 Sep 1;19(18).
- 482 7. Cole HA, PHB, KPS, & CCR. Religious beliefs and behaviors as predictors of substance  
483 use among college students. 2020;
- 484 8. Russell AM, Yu B, Thompson CG, Sussman SY, Barry AE. Assessing the relationship  
485 between youth religiosity and their alcohol use: A meta-analysis from 2008 to 2018. . *Addict*  
486 *Behavior*. 2020 Jul;
- 487 9. Fairclough J, AEM, MGJ, Abd-Elmomen, Merrin G.J. Religiosity and Associations with  
488 Substance Use and Delinquency Among Urban African American Adolescents. *J Relig*  
489 *Health*. 2024;63:531–50.

- 490 10. Moten AR, Wok S. Religiosity of malays living in Malaysian rural areas: An analytical  
491 survey. Vol. 15, International Journal of Islamic Thought. National University of Malaysia;  
492 2019. p. 1–16.
- 493 11. Nawı AM, Ismail R, Ibrahim F, Hassan MR, Manaf MRA, Amit N, et al. Risk and protective  
494 factors of drug abuse among adolescents: a systematic review. BMC Public Health. 2021  
495 Dec 1;21(1).
- 496 12. Hatta, Zulkarnain A. Religion and Drug Dependency: A Comparative Study of Malay Male  
497 Youth in Malaysia. Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought.,  
498 2010;29(4):337–48.
- 499 13. Zamani ZA, Nasir R, Desa A, Khairudin R, Yusooﬀ F. Family Functioning, Cognitive  
500 Distortion and Resilience among Clients under Treatment in Drug Rehabilitation Centres in  
501 Malaysia. Procedia Soc Behav Sci. 2014 Aug;140:150–4.
- 502 14. Gikandi AW, Egunjobi JP, Muriithi JK. Influence of Family Cohesion on Substance Use  
503 Disorders among the Youth in Selected Rehabilitation Centres in Nairobi County, Kenya.  
504 International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science. 2021;05(08):241–6.
- 505 15. Valeria S, Lilli H, Valeria V. Criminality, Substance abuse and Problematic Family  
506 Relations in Adolescence. J Addict Med Ther Sci. 2020 Apr 28;6(1):016–20.
- 507 16. Shakira Rodzlan Hasani WI, Arasu Saminathan T, Liana Ab Majid N, Ling Miaw Yn J,  
508 Mat Rifin H, Akmal Abd Hamid H, et al. Polysubstance use among adolescents in Malaysia:  
509 Findings from the National Health and Morbidity Survey 2017. 2021; Available from:  
510 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245593>
- 511 17. Ismail R, Shafurđın NS, Shukor MS, Mohammed Nawı A, Abdul Manaf MR, Ibrahim N,  
512 et al. Predictors of drug and substance abuse among school-going adolescents living in drug  
513 hotspot in Malaysia. PLoS One. 2024 Jun 1;19(6).
- 514 18. Ismail R, Manaf MRA, Hassan MR, Nawı AM, Ibrahim N, Lyndon N, et al. Prevalence of  
515 Drug and Substance Use among Malaysian Youth: A Nationwide Survey. Int J Environ Res  
516 Public Health. 2022 Apr 1;19(8).
- 517 19. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). (2019). World Drug Report 2019.  
518 Book 2: Global Overview of Drug Demand and Supply. United Nations publication. .
- 519 20. Jordan CJ, Andersen SL. Sensitive periods of substance abuse: Early risk for the transition  
520 to dependence. Dev Cogn Neurosci. 2017 Jun 1;25:29–44.
- 521 21. Institute for Public Health (IPH). National Health and Morbidity Survey (NHMS) 2022:  
522 Adolescent Health Survey. 2022. Malaysia.
- 523 22. Salleh, Hanafiah M, Kassim. Hatta Islamic Religiosity Scale 1996 (HIRS96)-A reliability  
524 and validity study. Malaysian Journal of Psychiatry. 2000;8(1):5–14.

- 525 23. Rabie M, Shaker NM, Gaber E, El-Habiby M, Ismail D, El-Gaafary M, et al. Prevalence  
526 updates of substance use among Egyptian adolescents. *Middle East Current Psychiatry*.  
527 2020 Dec 1;27(1).
- 528 24. Volkow ND, Han B, Einstein EB, Compton VM. Prevalence of Substance Use Disorders  
529 by Time Since First Substance Use Among Young People in the US. *JAMA Pediatric* .  
530 2021;175(6):640–3.
- 531 25. Bukten A, Virtanen S, Hesse M, Thylstrup B, Kvamme TL, Seid AK, et al. The prevalence  
532 of substance use disorders among people in Norwegian, Danish and Swedish prisons: A  
533 multi-national cohort study, 2010–19. *Addiction*. 2024 Jul 1;
- 534 26. Shahsavari Bami R, Khoshab H, Fadakar Davarani MM, Jahani Y, Nakhaee N, Nadrian H,  
535 et al. Prevalence and determinants of substance use among a sample of Iranian adolescents  
536 with ease of access to drugs: an application of Social Development Model. *Int J Health*  
537 *Promot Educ*. 2022;60(3):178–90.
- 538 27. Adade AE, Owusu Ansah K, Dey NEY, Arthur-Holmes F, Duah HO, Pascal A. Exposure  
539 to substance and current substance among school-going adolescents in Timor-Leste. *PLOS*  
540 *Global Public Health*. 2022 Aug 4;2(8):e0000797.
- 541 28. Ismail R, Manaf MRA, Hassan MR, Nawi AM, Ibrahim N, Lyndon N, et al. Prevalence of  
542 Drug and Substance Use among Malaysian Youth: A Nationwide Survey. *Int J Environ Res*  
543 *Public Health*. 2022 Apr 1;19(8).
- 544 29. de la Torre-Luque A, Ozeylem F, Essau CA. Prevalence of addictive behaviours among  
545 adolescents from 73 low-and middle-income countries. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*. 2021  
546 Dec 1;14.
- 547 30. Ihyauddin Z, Putri DAD, Teng kawan J, Ekawati FM, Sitaresmi MN. Tobacco Use among  
548 School-Age Adolescents in Indonesia: Findings from the 2015 Indonesia Global School-  
549 Based Student Health Survey. *Korean J Fam Med*. 2023;44(6):327–34.
- 550 31. Kifli N, Rizidah Z, Naing L. Smoking Initiation and Continuation-a Qualitative Study  
551 among Bruneian Male Adolescents *Asian Pac. Article in Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer*  
552 *Prevention [Internet]*. 2016;17(7):3533–40. Available from:  
553 <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309290976>
- 554 32. Hong SA, Peltzer K. Early Adolescent Patterns of Alcohol and Tobacco Use in Eight  
555 Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Member States. *Subst Use Misuse*.  
556 2019 Jan 28;54(2):288–96.
- 557 33. Fingesi TS, KLJ, OBO, EJE, & R, Kimaru, Okusanya, Ehiri, Rosales. Nicotine and Alcohol  
558 Use as Predictors of Recreational Cannabis Use in Adolescence: A Systematic Review and  
559 Narrative Synthesis. *Substance Use & Misuse*. 2024;1367–82.
- 560 34. Moor I, Winter K, Rathmann K, Ravens-Sieberer U, Richter M. Alcohol, tobacco and  
561 cannabis use in adolescence - Cross-sectional results of the 2017/18 HBSC study. *Journal*

- 562 of health monitoring [Internet]. 2020 Sep;5(3):69–87. Available from:  
563 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/35146274>
- 564 35. Lim KH, Lim HL, Teh CH, Kee CC, Khoo YY, Ganapathy SS, et al. Smoking among  
565 school-going adolescents in selected secondary schools in Peninsular Malaysia- findings  
566 from the Malaysian Adolescent Health Risk Behaviour (MyaHRB) study. *Tob Induc Dis*.  
567 2017 Jan 31;15(1):1–8.
- 568 36. Adade AE, Owusu Ansah K, Dey NEY, Arthur-Holmes F, Duah HO, Pascal A. Exposure  
569 to substance and current substance among school-going adolescents in Timor-Leste. *PLOS*  
570 *Global Public Health*. 2022 Aug 4;2(8):e0000797.
- 571 37. Sulaiman SN, Zainuddin A. Social Determinants of Drug Abuse Among Youth in Selangor:  
572 A Case Study in Serendah’s Rehabilitation Centre. Vol. 18, *Journal of Administrative*  
573 *Science*. 2021.
- 574 38. Srivastava S, Kumar P, Rashmi, Paul R, Dhillon P. Does substance use by family members  
575 and community affect the substance use among adolescent boys? Evidence from UDAYA  
576 study, India. *BMC Public Health*. 2021 Dec 1;21(1).
- 577 39. Obadeji A, Kumolalo BF, Oluwole LO, Ajiboye AS, Dada MU, Ebeyi RC. Substance Use  
578 among Adolescent High School Students in Nigeria and Its Relationship with Psychosocial  
579 Factors. *J Res Health Sci* . 2020;20(2).
- 580 40. Aschengrau A, Grippo A, Winter MR. Influence of Family and Community Socioeconomic  
581 Status on the Risk of Adolescent Drug Use. *Subst Use Misuse*. 2021;56(5):577–87.
- 582 41. Aliyu HB. Parental Education as a Potential Predictor of Adolescent Substance Use Status.  
583 *Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies* 10882. 2021;
- 584 42. Olson, David H, Gorall, Dean M. *Faces IV and the Circumplex model*. Minneapolis, MN:  
585 *Life Innovations*,. 2006;37(1):64–80.
- 586 43. Wangui Gikandi A, Pius Egunjobi J, Kiambi Muriithi J. *IJRISS* |Volume V, Issue VIII  
587 [Internet]. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. 2021.  
588 Available from: [www.rsisinternational.org](http://www.rsisinternational.org)
- 589 44. Pirzadeh, Shahryar, Parsakia, kamdin. A Comparative Study of Family Structure (Cohesion  
590 and Flexibility) and Functioning in People with and without Drug Abuse. *International*  
591 *Journal of Body, Mind & Culture* (2345-5802), 2023, Vol 10, Issue 1, p1. 2023;10(1):2345–  
592 5802.
- 593 45. Shek DTL, Zhu X, Dou D, Chai W. Influence of Family Factors on Substance Use in Early  
594 Adolescents: A Longitudinal Study in Hong Kong. *J Psychoactive Drugs*. 2020 Jan  
595 1;52(1):66–76.
- 596 46. Hoffmann JP. Family Structure, Unstructured Socializing, and Heavy Substance Use among  
597 Adolescents. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022 Jul 1;19(14).

- 598 47. Mathibela F, Mmamoagi Skhosana R. Parent-Adolescent Relationship and the Impact of  
599 Substance Dependency within the Trajectory of Adolescent Substance Use Disorder. In:  
600 Parenting - Studies by an Ecocultural and Transactional Perspective. IntechOpen; 2021.
- 601 48. Vitorino LM, Tostes JG, Ferreira JCL. Association between religiosity/spirituality and  
602 substance use among homeless individuals. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*.  
603 2024;70(2):330–9.
- 604 49. Wahab S, Baharom MA, Abd Rahman FN, A. Wahab K, Zulkifly MA, Azmi AD, et al. The  
605 relationship of lifetime substance-use disorder with family functioning, childhood  
606 victimisation, and depression, among juvenile offenders in Malaysia. *Addictive Behaviors*  
607 Reports. 2021 Dec 1;14.
- 608 50. Hoffmann JP. Parent-child Relations, Religiousness, and Adolescent Substance Use  
609 Disorders. *Journal of Drug Issues*. 2023;53(2):335–56.
- 610 51. Hosseini J, Shojaeefar E, Pooladgar P, Aliakbari F, Ganji M, Hamdieh M, et al. Prevalence  
611 of substance use among Iranian male adolescents: Systematic review and meta-analysis.  
612 *Health Sci Rep*. 2022 Nov 1;5(6).
- 613 52. Srivastava S, Kumar P, Rashmi, Paul R, Dhillon P. Does substance use by family members  
614 and community affect the substance use among adolescent boys? Evidence from UDAYA  
615 study, India. *BMC Public Health*. 2021 Dec 1;21(1).
- 616 53. Schuler MS, Tucker JS, Pedersen ER, D’Amico EJ. Relative influence of perceived peer  
617 and family substance use on adolescent alcohol, cigarette, and marijuana use across middle  
618 and high school. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2019 Jan 1;88:99–105.
- 619 54. Ode W, Rachman NN, Syafar M, Amiruddin R, Ode Rahmadania W, Gerung J. The Family  
620 Roles to Prevention of Drug Abuse in Adolescents. Vol. 16, *Malaysian Journal of Medicine*  
621 *and Health Sciences*. 2020.

622

623

## 624 **Declaration of interest**

625 The authors assert that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships  
626 that could have influenced the research provided in this paper. The authors declare the following  
627 financial interests/personal ties, which could be seen as potential competing interests.



628 **Conflict of interest**

629 All authors have no conflicts of interest to declare

630